

Appl. No. # 10/714,725

Amdt. dated

Reply to OA of 1/18/2005

Remarks/Arguments

112 issues

I reviewed them and fixed the errors.

102 and 103 issues


The triangular rail of claim 2 is not shown in Dence. Dence shows an end planar member that is triangular. The retractable side rails are not the same rails of the present invention. The present invention has a rail that is an axle path. Although the terms are very very similar, the function is different. To show the difference in function, the applicant will change that term 'rail' in the application to the more accurate term 'axle path'.

The axle path is formed as a slot that has a triangular route in the triangular sides of the table.

The patents cited by the examiner had a single fixed axle that does not travel in a path. Rather, the patents cited show a table rotating about a fixed axle. In that case, Dence Fig. 7, 10 show a fixed axle allowing rotation of the table about the axle. Therefore, the center of mass of the table in the cited patents does not move. In the applicant's invention, the center of mass moves to an equilibrium position below the axis of rotation that stabilizes the table. The triangular axle path accomplishes the center of mass movement. Each vertex of the triangular path is an equilibrium position.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Clement Cheng, Esq.

Law Offices of Clement Cheng

17220 Newhope St Ste 127

Fountain Valley, CA 92708-4283

(714) 825-0555 phone

(714) 825-0558 fax

law@clemcheng.com